

# pen and pistol

Causeway Publishing  
1101 Martin Luther King Jr. Blvd. #118  
Seattle, WA 98119  
causewaypublishing@riseup.net

neq  
bno  
lotziq

Causerie Publishing  
7101 Martin Luther King S. #116-118  
Seattle, WA 98119  
[causeriepublishing@riseup.net](mailto:causeriepublishing@riseup.net)

# preface

One of the most common forms of communication for contemporary anarchists is the internet. The positives associated with this form are generally centered around it's ease and speed. Information travels distances at a rate we cannot, opening up dialogues around anarchist tendencies and theories with those both near and far. Our sentiments of solidarity and affinity can follow these same paths of communication via social media, anarchist websites, blogs, etc.

Much is lost in our contemporary communication networks, including but not limited to the voices of those without access to the high-speed world of internet communiques and report-backs. Many comrades and friends are without the access we have all grown accustomed to, but that does not make their input any less valuable. This zine, and this distribution project in general are an attempt to help bring some of the thoughts we have about being anarchists, out here, to those who are anarchists on the inside. Without the pretentious tone of teaching, or guiding those down a similar path as our own, but with the want to find commonality where it lies and to identify where it doesn't.

These two texts in combination with each other are our attempt at continuing the conversation about anonymity and organization. The first text, the Sun Still Rises, outlines an international group's key points to their informal anarchist organization. While a lot has changed in both the world and within that particular group since then, we see value in looking back to their intentions and wants. The second text, a Letter to the Anarchist Galaxy, was written in 2011 as an anonymous critique of growing trends of international anarchist militancy, and it calls into question many of the intentions of what could be called the new leftist guerrilla. They are examples of a



dialogue that rages here where we sit, on the outside of the prison system.

We stole these poignant questions from the introduction to the Untorelli Press reprint of "letter to the anarchist galaxy" and we find them to be most appropriate...

*\*What is the point of the named group?*

*\*Does this merely invite repression? Does group coherency really matter?*

*\*Can anonymity help mitigate state repression?*

*\*Can it prevent our attacks from being recuperated into the Spectacle?*

*\*Can it mean the negation of political identities and an assertion of an individualism that evades subjectivity?*

And to them, we would like to add the specific caveat of prison. How does one's body being caged change the nature of our forms of revolt? How, as someone locked inside the prison system, do you interact with anonymity? With many radicals inside prison carrying the banner of socialism and/or state-communism, how does being an anarchist interact with the formal aspects of the imprisoned left?

Obviously, we speak about these topics only as generalities. We are not here to advocate for the creation of anything besides dialogue, and we are aware that the very nature of the life under surveillance we all lead makes this conversation drastically more difficult. With keeping those factors in mind, and everyone involved safe, we are reaching out to hear your thoughts. Please don't hesitate to write us...

Causerie Publishing  
7101 MLK S. #116-118  
Seattle, WA 98118





# introduction from untorelli press

In December 2008, Greece burned with the rage of a generation without hope, without the promise of any future. The murder of young anarchist Alexandros Grigoropoulos by the state woke the youth up to our current reality: in these times of crisis, the state will stop at nothing to cull the fiery tides of revolt. From the midst of burning police cars and occupied buildings came new relations, new strategies, new ways of living revolt. From beneath the smoke, new embers burned brightly.

The urban guerrilla, freed from its imprisonment in the dungeons of maoism, has regained its tongue and begun to speak new words. Cleared of the cobwebs of the 1970's, the new urban guerrilla is free to speak of a diffuse and generalized attack against the infrastructure of domination, a strategy that encompasses the thrown stone and arson attack, the street fight and the letter bomb. The conspiracy cells of fire, those enfant terrible of the Greek revolt, are bringing to life new forms.

The urban guerrilla of another time was one of hierarchy, martyrdom and leninism. It claimed to be the vanguard of the coming revolution, while always maintaining a patronizing view towards others which inevitably led toward fantasies of centralized power. The new guerrilla avoids these pitfalls. In this text by the Conspiracy Cells of Fire, self sacrifice is rejected, along with orthodoxy and hierarchy in all its forms. The CCF instead, proposes informal organization by tightly-knit groups of friends in which specialization is levelled by generalization of skills and knowledge, and in which daily life and intimate relationships are not separated from the practice of revolt. This is the revolutionary as diffuse guerrilla and the guerrilla as insurrectionist.

What we see is the implementation of insurrectionary anarchist methodology within the context of guerrilla warfare. While criticisms of armed struggle, militarism

and guerrilla warfare are central aspects of insurrectionary anarchist critique, these have thus far been a response to the Marxist-Leninist guerrilla warfare of the 60's and 70's, with its authoritarian communist rhetoric and joyless, sacrificed practices. What shows its masked face now is something more horrible: an insurrectionist guerrilla with contempt for all leaders and vanguards, whose revolt is as inextricably linked with the joy of life as it is with the urgency of our situation.

The new guerilla takes the insurrectionary anarchist strategy- until not applied more to riots, expropriations and window smashing - and offers other paths. The suggestion is of the possibility of strategic, specific attacks on the infrastructure of control in the service of weakening its intrusions into our lives and opening the possibility for attack. The CCF does not arrogantly claim that armed struggle or attacks on infrastructure are the only form revolt should take, but offers their strategy as one amongst a multiplicity of forms, each contributing in its specific way to the destruction of civilization.

None of this is to say that we should be uncritical of the new guerrilla tendency or the strategy/actions of the CCF. Instead, as the CCF advocates, we should be communicating on the faults and promises of strategies and tactics in order to better refine them so we can strike at the jugular of capital and the state without reproducing authoritarian social relations. The insistence on signed communiques as the form of communication, of the maintenance of named organizations, of the intensification of struggle must be approached critically in a time when revolt is taking anonymous, generalized forms, and in which repression is tightening more and more each day. Whether or not these are choices one wishes to make depends on one's particular inclinations and desires, and we must all struggle with this as we refine what an insurrectionary anarchist theory and practice could mean. As always we must take what is useful and leave the rest.



# the sun still rises

## **1. The Beginning**

The Fire Cells Conspiracy revolutionary organization didn't begin its activity from out of nowhere. It wasn't as if a straight line had cut through space and time. It was a future crying out from the past. The Conspiracy comprised a collective synthesis, connecting the backgrounds and viewpoints of all who participated in it and drawing valuable conclusions from past experiences of subversive projects and attacks we took part in.

It represented our desire to take a step further, not to climb some ladder of informal hierarchy that fetishizes violence and its methods, but to simply advance, move forward, and explore new perspectives, making the shift from a "bunch of friends" to an organization, from the sporadic to the consistent, from the spontaneous to the strategic.

Along the way, we assumed a critical stance toward the past, but we never went out of our way to be hostile. We are anarchy's misfits, born from its potent moments and gaping voids. Additionally, the goal of critique and self-critique is not to put an end to something, but just the opposite: it's an aspiration to evolve something. The fact that we're not going to elaborate a corresponding critical review right now doesn't mean we're afraid to recognize our mistakes. Rather, it's because that kind of examination is better served by distance and cool nerves than by impulse.

During no phase of our brief, intense history did we lose our collective memory of the anarchist milieu we come from. We also feel we discovered something we have in common with comrades who began the struggle before us, engaged in their own battles, were arrested and imprisoned, but never



lowered their heads. We discovered the unrepentant passion for revolution that connects histories and realities of struggle from different decades in a shared context of individual and collective liberation.

In that context, we forged our own alphabet. Speaking the language of direct action, we openly raised the issue of creating organized infrastructure. As anarchists, we often distance ourselves from the concept of organization because we equate it with hierarchy, roles, specialization, "you must," and obligations. However, words acquire the meanings given by the people who use them. As the Fire Cells Conspiracy, we stormed into battle over the meaning of revolutionary anarchist organization.

## ***2. The Path from Spark to Flame***

From the very beginning, we rejected the idea of a centralist model and chose to start from the basis of individual initiatives that wanted to collectivize. What emerged during organizational meetings were issues of coherence, consistency, individual and collective responsibility, and direct action as a means of transforming our words into deeds. At group meetings, each comrade had the opportunity to propose a plan of attack, thereby opening up a debate on planning, timing, political analysis, and operational problems posed by a given target's location. During these discussions, there was no guarantee that we would reach agreement. Opposing arguments sometimes developed into a powerful dialectic, especially regarding the strategy and prioritization of timing, and quite often there was more than one proposal, so we then had to choose which we were going to select and which we were going to keep in "storage" to be refined in the future. It was a process that allowed us to open our minds; broaden our horizons; learn from one another's different experiences; vigorously defend our opinions; figure out how to recognize our mistakes; understand the concept of shaping something

together; become conscious of the need for strategy; and — most important of all — create relationships not in the name of some “professional” revolutionary goal, but based on friendship, true comradeship, and real solidarity.

We love what we do because it contains our entire essence. Therefore, the “Conspiracy” isn’t just all of us together, it’s also each one of us apart. Even in cases when there wasn’t collective agreement on a particular action, we didn’t resort to “begging” from the prevailing democratic majority. Instead, the minority of comrades who insisted on carrying out the attack took the autonomous initiative to move forward with their choice. That happened in parallel with the rest of the collective, which supported them at specific times if necessary, naturally playing a part in our overall organization.

That’s why a number of communiqués were signed by groups (Nihilist Faction, Breath of Terror Commando, Terrorist Guerrilla Unit) that arose out of each separate initiative. During the second phase, after reaching agreement, whether as the entire collective or as a separate initiative, we planned the attack. Each one of us contributed our knowledge; information was culled from newspapers, magazines, and the Internet; the area where the action was to take place was reconnoitered and mapped; the approach to and withdrawal from the target was laid out (avoiding cameras and police checkpoints), including alternate routes in case something unexpected happened, and of course keeping in mind the eventuality of a confrontation with the pigs. There were also support groups, “hideouts,” ways of asking for help, etc. (In a future manual, we will analyze and explain our experiences, which are related to how we perceive what is going on while an attack is being carried out.)

During the third phase (which was never far removed from the initial proposal about target selection), we worked on the text of the communiqué. When a topic was suggested (for example, attacking the police), the comrade who made the



proposal argued for its content. Then a discussion began, during which each person fleshed out the concept, expressed disagreements, pointed out problems, and offered other ways to approach the topic. As soon as the debate finished, no matter how many meetings were needed to finish it, the collective brought together the central themes of all the meetings and shaped the main axes around which the communiqué would be written. The writing of a communiqué on a specific topic was usually shared out among those who wanted the responsibility, and after it was written, we got together to read it and make corrections, additions, and final touches. If the communiqué was connected to a separate initiative, then the comrades involved in that separate initiative were responsible for writing it.

The same process held for our Thessaloniki comrades, and when we collaborated as the Athens-Thessaloniki Fire Cells Conspiracy, comrades from both cities coordinated those actions based on principles of mutual aid and comradeship.

### **3. *“Everyone Does Everything”***

Of course, we’re well aware of the dangers lurking within each collective project that aspires to call itself antiauthoritarian — the appearance of informal hegemony and the reproduction of corrupt behavior, of which we are enemies. We feel that the purpose of power is to divide. To eliminate the possibility of the emergence of any informal hierarchy within our group, we struck directly at the heart of specialization and roles as soon as they surfaced. We said: “Everyone does everything.” Everyone can learn and devise ways to steal cars and motorcycles, fabricate license plates, forge ID cards and official documents, expropriate goods and money, target-shoot, and use firearms and explosives.

Therefore, it was and continues to be important to us that the means and methods we use for our actions be straightforward

and relatively simple to obtain and prepare, allowing them to spread and be used by anyone who decides to move toward the new urban guerrilla warfare. These include gasoline, jerry cans, camping gas canisters, and candles that can easily be obtained at a supermarket, but also improvised timing mechanisms that — after the appropriate “research” in technical manuals and guides available on the Internet, plus a little innovative imagination — anyone is capable of fabricating.

We certainly aren’t forgetting that, while “everyone does everything,” each person also has their own separate abilities and personal inclinations, and it would be a mistake to gloss over those differences. With desire and mutual understanding as our guide, each of us undertook to do what we felt most capable of. For example, if someone was a good driver or a skillful thief, or perhaps had a knack for writing, that didn’t mean their creative abilities would be suppressed in the name of some false collective homogeneity. It was up to each comrade to offer their abilities and methodologies to the other comrades without making a “sacrifice” of their own participation, and it was even better if that happened in the broadest possible way, going beyond the narrow context of the collective and facilitating access by the entirety of the antiauthoritarian current — for example, through the publication of practical guides like those released by some German comrades, which contain a number of different ways to make explosive devices.

Additionally, our actions never involved fixed, immutable roles. Without resorting to the cyclical rotation of tasks, which recall compulsory work hours, all the comrades took advantage of a common foundation that allowed them to be able to execute any task at any time during an attack. The process of improving your ability to use materials and techniques is naturally a continual process of self-education. Along those lines, we want to emphasize how crucial it is to simultaneously develop a group’s operational capacity as well as its revolutionary viewpoint. At no point should the level of sterile operational



capacity intensify without a corresponding intensification of thought and discourse, and the same obviously holds true for the converse. We had no central committee to designate roles. There were only particular tasks within a specific plan — positions that changed according to the desires of the comrades who took part.

#### ***4. Guerrillas for Life***

We've always felt that an organization doesn't necessarily have to be exclusive to the comrades who are part of it. Our action neither begins nor ends within the context of the group. The group is the means to revolution, not an end in itself. Because when the means become their own *raison d'être*, "diseases" begin to appear, like vanguardism, the armed party, and exclusive orthodox truth.

Through the Fire Cells Conspiracy, we say what we believe in, who we are, and what tendency we represent, but in no way do we say that someone has to precisely follow some so-called correct line or participate in our group in order to be recognized as a comrade.

Thus, we ourselves have also taken part in processes apart from the Conspiracy, like joining coordinated action networks, attending assemblies, participating in marches and demonstrations, supporting attacks and acts of sabotage, putting up posters, and painting slogans. But we never thought one thing was superior to another. That's because the polymorphism of revolutionary war consists of an open and permanent commitment that has nothing to do with fetishized spectacle (embracing armed struggle as the only thing that matters) or accusatory fixations (insisting on the quantitative characteristic of "massiveness" as the criterion for revolutionary authenticity). On the contrary, we position ourselves as enemies directly against the "polymorphism" of café gossip, speeches in university auditoriums, leadership

roles, followers, and all those conservative fossils of dogmatism and habit that act as parasites within the anarchist milieu, wanting only to control young comrades, sabotage them, and prevent them from creating their own autonomous evolutionary path through the revolutionary process.

We believe that the concept of the anarchist urban guerrilla isn't a separate identity one assumes only while engaging in armed attack. Rather, we feel it's a matter of merging each person's private and public life in the context of total liberation. We aren't anarchists only when we throw a Molotov at a riot police van, carry out expropriations, or plant an explosive device. We're also anarchists when we talk to our friends, take care of our comrades, have fun, and fall in love.

We aren't enlisted soldiers whose duty is revolution. We are guerrillas of pleasure who view the connection between rebellion and life as a prerequisite for taking action. We don't believe in any "correct line" to follow. During the past two years, for example, new urban guerrilla groups frequently posed the issue of robberies and expropriations from the banking machinery as yet another attack on the system. Their communiqués and claims of responsibility are powerful propaganda for the rejection of work via holdups and robberies directed at the belly of the capitalist beast — the banks — with the goal being individual liberation from the eight-hour blackmail of wage-slavery on the one hand, and collective appropriation of and direct access to money for infrastructural needs and revolutionary projects on the other.

We are exiting the scene of urban guerrilla warfare's past ethical fixations, which rarely took a public position on the issue of revolutionary bank robbery. We feel that there is now plenty of new urban guerrilla discourse and practice that opposes — in a clearly attacking way — the bosses' work ethic as well as the predatory banking machinery, proposing armed expropriation as a liberatory act, and obviously not as a way to



get rich.

Nevertheless, we don't consider the expropriation of banks to be a prerequisite for someone's participation in the new guerrilla war. There is one revolution, but there are thousands of ways in which one can take revolutionary action. Other comrades might choose to carry out collective expropriations from the temples of consumerism (supermarkets, shopping malls) in order to individually recover what's been "stolen" and use those things to meet each person's material needs, thereby avoiding having to say "good morning" to a boss or take orders from some superior. Still others might participate in grassroots unions, keeping their conscience honed — like a sharp knife — for the war that finally abolishes every form of work that enriches the bosses while impoverishing our dignity.

We feel the same way about voluntarily "disappearing" to go underground. The fetishization of illegalism doesn't inspire us. We want everyone to act in accordance with their needs and desires. Each choice naturally has its own qualities and virtues as well as its disadvantages. It's true that when a group voluntarily chooses to go underground ("disappearance" from the environment of family and friends, false papers, etc.), that certainly shields them from the eyes of the enemy. But at the same time, their social connection to the wider radical milieu is cut, and to a certain point they lose a sense of interaction. Of course, the same doesn't apply when there are objective reasons for going underground (arrest warrants, a price on one's head), in which case clandestinity is the attacking refuge of those caught in the crosshairs of the law. This creates a parallel need for the existence of support infrastructure, both among guerrilla groups themselves as well as within the wider antiauthoritarian milieu, that will "cover" the tracks of wanted comrades. Prerequisites would be a certain complicity and discretion, which concepts are frequently seen as "outdated" but in our opinion should once again be launched piercingly into battle. If comrades from a guerrilla group engage in regular above-ground interaction — participating in movement meetings and processes, taking part in debates, and creating projects with others that address shared concerns — then the hermetic nature of the guerrilla group should clearly be protected from open ears and big mouths. Therefore, it's general attitude also must be one of discretion in order to circumvent the deafening exaggerations that can turn it into a "magnet" for bastards from antiterrorist squads and the police. Taking a page from our own self-critique, we must mention the fact that many of us behaved

completely opposite to the above, which — along with the viciousness of certain conduct originating within the anarchist milieu — “guided” a number of police operations right to us. In any case, self-critique lays down solid ground from which to develop oneself and offer explanations, but the current text isn’t appropriate for that. We’ll return to it in the future.

## ***5. The First Phase of the Conspiracy and the Proposal for the “New Conspiracy”***

The guerrilla has finally escaped the pages of books dealing with decades past and taken to the streets with ferocity. Because the urban guerrilla doesn’t offer utopian freedom. She allows access to immediate freedom. Accordingly, each person begins to define herself and liberate herself from society’s passivity.

There is now noise everywhere — the marvelous noise of widespread destruction — as well as the requisite revolutionary discourse to follow bombings against targets that serve domination. A determined armada of anarchist groups is setting fire to tranquility in the middle of the night, groups with names that reflect the “menu” they offer the system (in Athens: Deviant Behavior for the Spread of Revolutionary Terrorism, Warriors from the Abyss/Terrorist Complicity, Revolutionary Conscience Combatants, Lambros Fountas Guerrilla Formation; in Thessaloniki: Chaos Warriors, Attacking Solidarity Cell, Arson Attack Cell, Schemers for Nighttime Disorder, Fire to the Borders Cell, Combative Conscience Cell, Revolutionary Solidarity Cell, etc.). Many of these groups are also experimenting with a new international liberatory project as accomplices in the alliance known as the International Revolutionary Front/Informal Anarchist Federation.

Those of us who have taken responsibility as members of the Fire Cells Conspiracy are not intimidated by the dozens of years in prison the courts have in store for us. To begin with, we are creating an active collective inside prison.



We know that, for us, the opening phase of the struggle has been completed. However, we also know that nothing is over. The Conspiracy will not remain disarmed. It will continue to be a valid commitment in prison, as well as an open proposal to the antagonistic sector of the metropolis.

The Fire Cells Conspiracy proved itself as a network of cells, just like its name suggests. Right now, we're not attempting to go over its operational record. We simply want to clarify its political perspective.

We feel that committing to a new Conspiracy most closely approaches the essence of the word, so we are opening up that possibility by making a proposal for a new Conspiracy comprising a diffuse, invisible network of cells that have no reason to meet in person, yet through their actions and discourse recognize one another as comrades in the same political crime: the subversion of Law and Order. This Conspiracy would consist of individuals and cells that take action, whether autonomous or coordinated (through call-outs and communiqués), without needing to agree on every single position and specific reference point (e.g., nihilism, individualism). Instead, they would connect on the basis of mutual aid focused on three key points.

The first point we are proposing in this informal debate is agreement on the choice of direct action using any means capable of damaging enemy infrastructure. Without any hierarchization of methods of violence, comrades can choose from rocks to Kalashnikovs. However, direct action on its own is just another entry on the police blotter, so it should be accompanied by a corresponding communiqué from the given cell or individual claiming responsibility and explaining the reasons behind the attack, thus spreading revolutionary discourse. The pen and the pistol are made from the same metal. Here, let's note that the Conspiracy of the period that is now over never dismissed any incendiary method in its arsenal.

It would be disingenuous of us if some young comrade thought that using the name of a new "Conspiracy" was conditioned by the use of supposedly superior methods (e.g., explosives). The new urban guerrilla warfare depends much less on operational methods than it does on our decision to attack power.

The second key point of agreement is to wage war against the state while simultaneously engaging in a pointed critique of society. Since we are revolutionary anarchists, we don't just talk about the misfortune caused by power and the ruling oligarchy. We also exercise a more comprehensive critique of the way in which the oppressed accept and propagate the promises of happiness and consumerism offered by their bosses.

The fact that we engage in struggle against the state doesn't mean we blind ourselves to the diffuse complex of power that administers contemporary interpersonal relationships. Antiauthoritarian discourse frequently alters and generalizes a concept like the state, relieving the rest of the people who constitute society of their responsibility. In doing so, it creates a sterilized viewpoint that treats entire social sectors as revolutionary subjects, whether called proletariat or oppressed, without revealing the individual responsibility each one of us assumes in the enslavement of our lives.

*The state is not a fortress. You won't find any door that leads you to some kind of machine or engine that can be turned off by throwing a switch. The state is not a monster you can kill with a stake through the heart. It's something quite different. We could compare it to a system: a network comprising thousands of machines and switches. This network doesn't impose itself on society from above. It spreads throughout society from within. It even extends to the sphere of private life, reaching into and touching our emotions at a cellular level. It molds conscience and is molded by it. It connects and unites society, which in turn nourishes and sanctifies it in a continuous exchange of values*



*and standards. In this game, there are no spectators. Each one of us plays an active role.*

*— Costas Pappas, No Going Back*

The enemy can be found in every mouth that speaks the language of domination. It is not exclusive to one or another race or social class. It doesn't just consist of rulers and the whole potbellied suit-and-tie dictatorship. It is also the proletarian who aspires to be a boss, the oppressed whose mouth spits nationalist poison, the immigrant who glorifies life in western civilization but behaves like a little dictator among his own people, the prisoner who rats out others to the guards, every mentality that welcomes power, and every conscience that tolerates it.

We don't believe in an ideology of victimization in which the state takes all the blame. The great empires weren't just built on oppression. They were also built on the consent of the applauding masses in the timeless Roman arenas of every dictator. To us, the revolutionary subject is each one who liberates herself from the obligations of the present, questions the dominant order of things, and takes part in the criminal quest for freedom.

As the first phase of the Conspiracy, we have no interest in representing anyone, and we don't take action in the name of any class or as defenders of "oppressed society." The subject is us, because each rebel is a revolutionary subject in a revolution that always speaks in the first person to ultimately build a genuine collective "we."

The third key point of agreement in our proposal regarding the formation of a new Conspiracy is international revolutionary solidarity. In truth, our desire to apply all of ourselves to creating moments of attack on the world order may cost some of us our lives, with many of us winding up in prison. "We" doesn't refer to the Conspiracy or any other organization. It

refers to every insurgent, whether they are part of a guerrilla group or taking action individually on their path to freedom. As the first phase of the Conspiracy, our desire and our proposal to every new cell is that the full force of revolutionary solidarity be expressed — a solidarity that cries out through texts, armed actions, attacks, and sabotage to reach the ears of persecuted and imprisoned comrades, no matter how far away they may be.

The solidarity we're talking about doesn't require those showing solidarity to express absolute political identification with the accused. It is simply a shared acknowledgment that we are on the same side of the barricades and that we recognize one another in the struggle, like another knife stuck in power's gut. We therefore also propose support for the Informal Anarchist Federation/International Revolutionary Front, so that it can function — as demonstrated by the Italian FAI comrades — as an engine of propulsion.

From this point on, any comrade who agrees (obviously without having to identify herself) with these three key points of the informal agreement we are proposing can — if she wants — use the name Fire Cells Conspiracy in connection with the autonomous cell she is part of. Just like the Dutch comrades who, without us knowing one another personally but within the framework of consistency between discourse and practice, attacked the infrastructure of domination (arson and cyber attacks against Rabobank) and claimed responsibility as the Fire Cells Conspiracy (Dutch Cell).

We feel that a network of such cells, devoid of centralized structure, will be capable of far exceeding the limits of individual plans while exploring the real possibilities of revolutionary coordination among autonomous minority structures. These structures — without knowing one another personally — will in turn be able to organize arson and bombing campaigns throughout Greece, but also on an international



level, communicating through their claims of responsibility.

Since we live in suspicious times, we should clarify something. Actions claimed using the Fire Cells Conspiracy name that aren't consistent with any of the points we've laid out and don't take the necessary precautions to prevent "damage" to anything other than the target of the sabotage will definitely arouse our suspicion, given the likelihood that they will have been hatched by the state.

Returning to our proposal, "anonymity" with regard to personal contact will reinforce the closed nature of the autonomous cells, making it more difficult for the police to "compromise" them. Even the arrest of one entire cell that forms part of the new Conspiracy wouldn't lead the persecuting authorities to the other cells, thereby avoiding the well-known domino effects that took place in our time.

In the past, the fact that that we first-phase comrades may not have been involved in certain incidents never stopped us from publicly expressing our support or our critique, and the same applies to the present if new comrades choose to use the organization's name. Without needing to know one another, through the communiqués that accompany attacks we can begin an open debate on reflections and problems that, even if viewed through different lenses, are certainly focused on the same direction: revolution.

Consequently, we first-phase comrades are now assuming responsibility for the discourse we generate inside prison by signing as the Fire Cells Conspiracy, followed by our names.

The new "Conspiracy" will maintain and safeguard its customary independence, writing its own history of struggle. This significant continuation will surely connect the dots on the map of rebellion, sweeping them toward the final destination of revolution.

## ***6. The Epilogue Has Yet to Be Written***

Through our actions, we are propagating a revolution that touches us directly, while also contributing to the destruction of this bourgeois society. The goal is not just to tear down the idols of power, but to completely overturn current ideas about material pleasure and the hopes behind it.

We know our quest connects us to many other people around the world, and via this pamphlet we want to send them our warmest regards: the Fire Cells Conspiracy in the Netherlands; the FAI in Italy; the Práxedes G. Guerrero Autonomous Cells for Immediate Revolution and the ELF/ALF in Mexico; the ELF in Russia; the anarchists in Bristol, Argentina, and Turkey; the Autonome Gruppen in Germany; the September 8 Vengeance Commando in Chile; the comrades in Switzerland, Poland, Spain, and London; and everyone we've left out, wherever the rejection of this world is in bloom.

This text has no epilogue, because praxis will always continue to nourish and transform itself. We're just making a quick stop, concluding with a few words someone once said:

It's an astonishing moment when the attack on the world order is set in motion. Even at the very beginning — which was almost imperceptible — we already knew that very soon, no matter what happened, nothing would be the same as before. It's a charge that starts slowly, quickens its pace, passes the point of no return, and irrevocably detonates what once seemed impregnable — so solid and protected, yet nevertheless destined to fall, demolished by strife and disorder... On this path of ours, many were killed or arrested, and some are still in enemy hands. Others strayed from the battle or were wounded, never to appear again. Still others lacked courage and retreated. But I must say that our group never wavered, even when it had to face the very heart of destruction.



— Fire Cells Conspiracy: Gerasimos Tsakalos, Olga Economidou, Haris Hatzimichelakis, Christos Tsakalos, Giorgos Nikolopoulos, Michalis Nikolopoulos, Damiano Bolano, Panayiotis Argyrou, Giorgos Polydoras

THE UNIVERSITY OF CHICAGO  
LIBRARY  
1100 EAST 58TH STREET  
CHICAGO, ILL. 60637



# introduction from untorelli press

The following appeared online November 2011 and quickly made the rounds of the usual anarchist websites. The anonymous critique is aimed incisively at the growing tendency within international insurrectional anarchism that posits a new guerrilla warfare. Unlike the guerrilla warfare of the New Left, this guerrilla is diffuse, anarchist, and for a total rupture with the existent.

While it is natural for those of us who desire the destruction of civilization to smile widely at consistent news of anarchist armed struggle, we must also remain critical. Much of this debate should be formulated face-to-face by each group of individuals taking action against control. However, space remains for open critique and counter-critique within insurrectional circles. The Conspiracy of Cells of Fire themselves push an idea of a new critique, one attached to notices of attack, through which we may formulate new methods and strategies. While the authors of this piece may disagree with the necessity of each critical text coming in the form of a communiqué, one agreement stands: we must remain active in our search for paths toward the active destruction of domination and control.

The questions remain:

Does insurrectionary anarchism mean the conscious intensification of attack by individuals and groups? Or is it the generalization of revolt - its tools and skills - to every part of society? Are these two mutually exclusive?

What is the point of the named group? Does this merely invite repression? Does group coherency really matter?

Can anonymity help mitigate state repression? Can it prevent

our attacks from being recuperated into the Spectacle? Can it mean the negation of political identities and an assertion of an individualism that evades subjectivity?

Can guerrilla warfare truly be separated from vanguardism, specialization, and formalism? Is the anarchist guerrilla a totally different breed?

I offer these questions because I do not have answers. While named groups stir up visions of arrogant Leninism, I cannot hold back my smile when I hear of any blow against domination. I want to envision a path toward rupture, toward the total destruction of the existent. What that means is unknown. We publish this text not as a condemnation of our comrades of the anarchist, anti-civilization, and nihilist armed struggle, but as a small contribution to that struggle.

Solidarity always to those who attack domination, named or unnamed.

Untorelli Press

# letter to the anarchist galaxy

Uninvited, we are forcing ourselves on a debate that is not ours. And which never will be, as it is set on a terrain that remains sterile for the development of insurrectional perspectives and the anarchist ideas and activities that focus on such a development. So, you might ask, why write a letter? Because nothing is closer to our hearts than liberatory and destructive revolt, than the struggle for the subversion of the existent, because we will never stop recognizing ourselves in all comrades who decide to attack the structures and people of power out of a desire for freedom; because there are few things we cherish more than individual will, the striving for coherence and the courage of lighting the fuse, above everything. Don't think we are writing this premise in an attempt to please; it is sincere, as is our concern about the voluntary amputation of the domain of anarchist struggle.

Let's be clear:

More than ever there is a need for the destructive intervention of anarchists, more than ever it is the moment to intensify, to search for possibilities and hypotheses enabling the extension of revolt and insurrection and in this way speed up the overturning of this world. But this need and urge don't absolve us from the obligation to think about what, where, how and why.

Let's be straightforward:

For what reasons are anarchists (we don't have any difficulty in understanding why authoritarians would do so) systematically claiming their acts and signing them with acronyms that have become famous worldwide?



What brings them to associate this road with an excessive form of coherence between thinking and acting, between theory and practice, while in fact it is simply the illusory abolition of a permanent tension which should exist between them and which is beyond doubt the moving strength behind the anarchist movement?

This spreading mania risks casting its shadow over all acts of revolt. Not only actions by anarchists that merrily pass through the bitter and always disappointing pill of the claim but also, and perhaps especially, the action of the more general panorama of rebellion and social conflictuality. Maybe that is one of the 'reasons' that pushed us to write this text. Tired of experiencing and finding the anarchist field of attack, sabotage and expropriation more and more assimilated to an acronym and, as such, political representation; tired of seeing the horizon narrowing into two falsely opposing choices: either 'respectable' anarchism, running behind assemblies, social movements and base trade unions; or 'bad' anarchism, being kindly asked to stamp your contributions to the social war with some acronym — and if you don't, someone else will do it for you.

Because we also choose to attack. We also sabotage the machinery of capital and authority. We also choose to not accept a position of begging and are not putting off the necessary expropriation until tomorrow. But we do think that our activities are simply part of a wider social conflictuality, a conflictuality that doesn't need claims and acronyms. We believe that only when actions are anonymous can they really be appropriated by everyone. We believe that putting a stamp on an attack is moving the attack from the social to the political field, to the field of representation, delegation, actors and spectators. And, as has often been said before in this kind of debate, it's not enough to proclaim the refusal of politics: its refusal implicates coherence between means and aims, and the claim is a political instrument just like the membership card,

the program, the declaration of principles.

Over and above that, there is some confusion that we want to expose, because we can't continue to simply stand by and watch a content which is more and more being given over to concepts such as informality. The choice of an informal autonomous anarchist movement implies the refusal of fixed structures, of membership organisations, of centralising and unifying federations; and therefore also fixed recurring signatures, if not all signatures. It is the refusal of the drawing up of programs, the banishment of all political means; and thereby also of programmatic claims that claim to be in the position of outlining campaigns.

It is the refusal of all centralisation; and so equally of all umbrella structures, no matter whether they declare themselves verbally 'informal' or formal. In a positive sense, to us informality signifies an unlimited and undefined archipelago of autonomous groups and individuals which are forging ties based on affinity and mutual knowledge and who decide upon that basis to realize common projects. It is the choice for small, affinity-based circles which make their own autonomy, perspectives and methods of action the basis for creating ties with others. Informal organization has nothing to do with either federations or acronyms. And what brought some comrades to speak not only about informality, but about 'insurrectionalism' as well? With the risk of devaluing the wide panorama of ideas, analyses, hypotheses and proposals, we could say that 'insurrectionalism' contains the methods and perspectives which, out of a non-compromising anarchism, want to contribute to 'insurrectional situations'. The anarchist arsenal of methods for this contribution is enormous. Moreover, the use of methods (agitation, attack, organisational proposals etc.) in itself means hardly anything : only in a thought-out and evolving 'projectuality' do they acquire meaning in the struggle. Setting fire to a State building is beyond doubt always a good thing, but it is not necessarily inscribed in an

insurrectional perspective 'as such'. And this counts even less for the choice, for example of aiming attacks particularly against rather central, spectacular targets, accompanied by confessions of faith. It is no coincidence that during other moments of insurrectional projectualities, the emphasis was put particularly on modest, reproducible, anonymous actions of attack compared to the more centralized structures and people of power, or on the necessity of well-aimed sabotage of infrastructures that don't need echoes in the media in order to reach their goals, for example the immobilization of transport, data, and energy supplies.

It seems that there are not all that many perspectives behind the current mania for claims, or at least, we have difficulty in discovering them. In fact, and this doesn't imply that we want to underestimate the sincere and courageous rebellion of those comrades, it seems as if there is above all a striving for recognition. A recognition by the enemy, who will hurry to complete its list of terrorist organisations, often signifying the beginning of the end: the enemy starts working to isolate a part of the conflictuality from the wider conflictuality, an isolation which is not only the forerunner of repression (and actually it doesn't really matter, repression is always there — we're not going to weep about the fact that anarchist activities are always being followed by the eyes of the Argus, and thus prosecuted), but especially, and that's the most important, it is the most effective means to combat all possible infection.

In the current condition of the social body, which is sick and deteriorating, the best thing for power is a clearly recognizable and definable knife which tries to stab a piece of it, while the worst for power is a virus that risks harming the whole body in an intangible and therefore uncontrollable way. Or are we mistaken, and is it all more about recognition by the exploited and excluded? But are we as anarchists not against all forms of delegation, of shining examples which often legitimize resignation? Most certainly, our practices can be contagious,



and our ideas even more, but only on condition that they bring back the responsibility to act to each separate individual, when they question resignation as being an individual choice.

To inflame hearts, most certainly, but when this lacks the oxygen of one's own conviction, the fire will extinguish fast and in the best case will simply be followed up by some applause for the upcoming martyrs. And even then, it would really be too ironic if the principal opponents of politics, the anarchists, were to take up the torch of representation and, in the footsteps of their authoritarian predecessors, separate social conflictuality from the immediate subversion of all social roles, and do this in times when political mediation (political parties, unions, reformism) is slowly becoming obsolete and outmoded. And it makes no difference whether they want to do this by taking the lead of social movements, speaking great truths in popular assemblies or by means of a specific armed group.

Or is it all about striving for 'coherence'? Unfortunately, the anarchists that exchange the quest for coherence for tactical agreements, nauseating alliances and strategic separations between means and aims have always existed.

Anarchist coherence is beyond doubt also to be found in the denial of all this. But this doesn't mean that, for example, a certain condition of 'clandestinity' would be more coherent. When clandestinity is not seen as a necessity (either because repression is hunting us down or because it is necessary for certain action), but as some kind of pinnacle of revolutionary activity, there is not so much left over from the infamous a-legalism. In order to imagine this, it might suffice to compare it to the social situation in Europe: it is not because thousands of people are living in a really 'clandestine' situation (people without papers), that it makes them automatically and objectively a threat to legalism and crowns them as 'revolutionary subjects'. Why would it be any different for anarchists living under conditions of clandestinity?

Or might it all be about frightening the enemy? A recurring element in claims is that apparently there are anarchists who believe they can scare power by expressing threats, publishing pictures of weapons or exploding little bombs (and let's not mention the despicable practice of sending letter bombs). In comparison to the daily slaughter organized by power it seems kind of naïve, especially to those who have no illusions left concerning rulers that are more sensitive, capitalism with a human face, or more honest relations within the system. If power, despite its arrogance, were to fear anything it would be the spread of revolt, the sowing of disobedience, the uncontrolled igniting of hearts. And of course, the lightning of repression will not spare anarchists that want to contribute to this, but that doesn't prove how 'dangerous' we are in any way whatsoever, it maybe only speaks about how dangerous it would be if our ideas and practices were to spread among among the excluded and exploited.

We are continually surprised about how little the idea of some kind of shadow is able to please contemporary anarchists, the ones that don't want to resign themselves, wait or build mass organisations.

We used to be proud of it:

We would put all on all to make the swamp of social conflictuality extend and so make it impossible for the forces of repression and recuperation to penetrate. We didn't go searching for the spotlight, or for the glory of the warrior: in the shadow, at the dark side of society we contributed to the disturbance of normality, to the anonymous destruction of structures of control and repression, to the 'liberation' of time and space through sabotage so that the social revolt could continue. And we used to diffuse our ideas proudly, in an autonomous way, without making use of the echoes of the media, far away from the political spectacle including the

‘oppositional’ one. An agitation which was not striving to be filmed, recognized, but which tried to fuel rebellion everywhere and forge ties with other rebels in the shared revolt.

It seems that today more than a few comrades have chosen the easy solution of identity over the circulation of ideas and revolt, and have in this way reduced affinity relations to a joining something. Of course it is easier to pick up some ready-made product off the shelves of the militant market of opinions and consume it, rather than develop a proper struggle track that makes a rupture with it. Of course it is easier to give oneself the illusion of strength by using a shared acronym than to face the fact that the ‘strength’ of subversion is to be found to the degree and in the way it can attack the social body with liberating practices and ideas. Identity and ‘formation of a front’ might offer the sweet illusion of having meaning, especially in the spectacle of communication technology, but doesn’t clear every obstacle from the road. Even more, it shows all the symptoms of sickness of a not-so-anarchist conception of struggle and revolution, which believes in being able to pose an illusory anarchist mastodon before the mastodon of power in a symmetrical way. The immediate consequence is the evermore narrowing of the horizon to a not-so-interesting introspection, some patting on the back here and there and the construction of a framework of exclusive self-reference.

It wouldn’t surprise us if this mania were to paralyse the anarchist movement even regarding our contribution to more and more frequent, spontaneous and destructive revolts. Being locked up in self-promotion and self-reference, with communication reduced to publishing claims on the internet, it doesn’t seem that anarchists will be able to do a lot (apart from the obligatory explosions and arsons, often against targets which the people in revolt are already very much destroying themselves) when the situation is exploding in their neighbourhood. It seems that the closer we seem to get to the possibility of insurrections, the more tangible these



possibilities are becoming, the less anarchists want to be busy with it. And this counts equally for those who are closing up themselves in some ideology of armed struggle. But what are we talking about when we speak about insurrectionary perspectives? Definitely not just about a multiplicity of attacks, even less when these seem to tend towards the exclusive terrain of the anarchists with their fronts. Much more than a singular armed duel with the State, insurrection is the multiple rupture with time, space and roles of domination, a necessarily violent rupture which can signify the beginning of the subversion of social relations. In that sense, insurrection is rather a social unleashing, which goes further than a generalizing of revolt or riots, but which already carries in its negation the beginning of a new world, or at least should do. It is precisely the presence of such utopian tension that offers some grip against the return to normality and the recovery of social roles after the great feast of destruction. So it may be clear that insurrection is not a purely anarchist matter, although our contribution to it, our preparation towards it, our insurrectional perspectives, could in future times be beyond doubt important and maybe decisive for pushing the unchaining of negation towards a liberating direction. Abandoning in advance these difficult issues — which should be gaining importance in a world that is becoming more and more unstable — by locking ourselves up in some identity-based ghetto and cherishing the illusion of developing ‘strength’ by common signatures and the ‘unification’ of anarchists that are prepared to attack, inevitably becomes the negation of all insurrectionary perspectives.

To get back to the world of fronts and acronyms, we could for example mention the obligatory references to imprisoned comrades as a clear sign of the restraining ourselves within a framework of exclusive self-reference. It seems that once locked up by the State, these comrades are no longer comrades like we are, but are precisely ‘imprisoned’ comrades. In this way, the positions in their already difficult and painful debates become fixed in a way that can have only two exits: either the absolute

glorification of our imprisoned comrades, or absolute rejection, which can very quickly turn into a renouncement of developing and embodying solidarity.

Does it still make sense to continue repeating that our imprisoned comrades are neither positioned above or below other comrades, but are simply among them? Isn't it remarkable that, despite the many struggles against prisons, the present current is again coming out with 'political' prisoners, abandoning a more general perspective of struggle against prison, justice,...? In this way we risk completing what the State was already trying to realise in the first place by locking our comrades up: by turning them into abstract, idolized and central reference points, we are isolating them from the social war as a whole. Instead of looking for ways to maintain ties of solidarity, affinity and complicity across the walls, by placing everything in the middle of social war, solidarity is shrinking into the quoting of names at the end of a claim. On top of that, this is generating a nasty circular motion without much perspective, a higher level of attacks which are 'dedicated' to others, rather than taking strength from ourselves and from the choice of when, how and why to intervene in given circumstances.

But the logic of armed struggle-ism is unstoppable. Once set in motion, it unfortunately becomes very difficult to counter. Everybody that doesn't join and take up its defence is compared to comrades that don't want to act or attack, that submit revolt to calculations and masses, that only want to wait and are refusing the urge to light the fuse here and now. In the deformed mirror, the refusal of the ideology of armed struggle is equal to the refusal of armed struggle itself. Of course this is not true, but for who wants to hear that, there is no space for discussion left open. Everything is being reduced to a thinking in blocks, for and against, and the path which we think is more interesting, the development of insurrectional projectualities is disappearing into the background. To the applause of the

formal libertarians and the pseudo-radicals as well as the repressive forces, who desire nothing more than the drying up of this swamp.

Because who still wants to discuss projectuality today, when the only rhythm that the struggle seems to have is the sum of the attacks claimed on the internet? Who is still searching for a perspective that wants to do more than strike a little? There is, by the way, no doubt about that: striking is necessary, here and now, and with all the means that we think appropriate and opportune. But the challenge of the development of a projectuality, which aims at the attempt of unchaining, extending or deepening insurrectional situations, demands a bit more than the capacity to strike. It demands the development of proper ideas and not the repetition of other people's words, the strength to develop real autonomy in terms of struggle and capacities; the slow and difficult search for affinities and the deepening of mutual knowledge; a certain analysis of the social circumstances in which we act; the courage to elaborate hypotheses for the social war in order to stop running behind facts or ourselves.

In short: it doesn't only demand the capacity to use certain methods but especially the ideas of how, where, when and why to use them, and then in combination with a whole spectre of other methods. Otherwise there will be no anarchists left, only a spectrum of fixed roles: propagandists, squatters, armed strugglers, expropriators, writers, window breakers, rioters, etc. There would be nothing more painful than to find ourselves so unarmed in the face of the coming social storm than for each one of us to have only one speciality left. There would be nothing worse in explosive social situations than having to note that anarchists are too much involved in their own backyard to be able to really contribute to the explosion. It would give the most bitter taste of missed opportunities when we, by focusing exclusively on the identity ghetto, would abandon the discovery of our accomplices inside the social storm,



the forging of ties of shared ideas and practices with other rebels, breaking with all forms of mediated communication and representation and in this way opening up space for true mutuality which is allergic to all power and domination.

But as always we refuse to despair. We are aware that many comrades are searching for possibilities to attack the enemy and forge ties with other rebels through the spreading of anarchist ideas and struggle proposals, in a time and space that abandons all political spectacle. It is probably the most difficult path, because it will never be rewarded. Not by the enemy, not by the masses and most probably not by other comrades and revolutionaries. But we carry a history inside of us, a history that connects us to all anarchists and which will obstinately continue to refuse to be enclosed, either within the 'official' anarchist movement, or in the armed-struggle-ist reflection of it. Those who continue to refuse to spread ideas separately from the ways in which we spread them, thus trying to exile all political mediation, including the claim. Those who don't care much about who did this or that, but connect it to their own revolt, their own projectuality which expands in the only conspiracy we want: the one of rebellious individualities for the subversion of the existent.

the forging of ties of shared ideas and practices with other rebels, interaction with all forms of mediated communication and in this way opening up space for true actuality which is allergic to all power and domination.

But as always we refuse to despair. We are aware that many comrades are searching for possibilities to attack the enemy and forge ties with other rebels through the spreading of anarchist ideas and struggle proposals in a time and space that abandons all political spectacle. It is probably the most difficult path, because it will never be rewarded. Not by the enemy, not by the masses and most probably not by other comrades and revolutionaries. But we carry a history inside of us, a history that connects us to all anarchists and which will obstinately continue to refuse to be enclosed, either within the official anarchist movement or in the armed-struggleist reflection of it. Those who continue to refuse to spread ideas separately from the ways in which we spread them, thus trying to exile all political mediation, including the class. Those who don't care much about who did this or that, but connect it to their own revolt, their own projectuality which expands in the only conspiracy we want: the one of rebellious individualities for the subversion of the existent.





